# Less Sinnned Against than Sinning:

Shylock in the Retold Stories in 1870-1920

**Shinichi Suzuki**

## I

Henry Irving's Shylock, represented as "a man more sinned against than sinning," was dominant over productions of *The Merchant of Venice* on English stages in the late nineteenth century. His production was so successful that it undoubtedly played a significant role in the reception history of Shylock. However, other forms, such as Shakespeare prepared for children's use, of *The Merchant of Venice* were also quite popular in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, though far fewer scholars have discussed this topic compared to the theatrical productions and the critical history of the play.

Therefore, this paper discusses this rather neglected topic in the reception history of Shakespeare, in order to contribute to clarifying the public understanding of Shylock at that time. This paper consists of two parts: the popularity of prose stories of *The Merchant of Venice* intended as children's reading, and the representation of Shylock in the retold prose stories.

As for the popularity and significance of Shakespeare prepared for children, several scholars have observed the significance of these versions. Stanley Wells in a lecture given to the British Academy, points out the considerable popularity of the prose stories of Shakespeare's plays while Noel Perrin reveals the enormous publication volume of bowdlerized edition of Shakespeare. These works are summarized by Gary Taylor in his *Reinventing Shakespeare* and the critique is developed by Janet Bottoms, who analyzes how the readership of young ladies affected the representation of stories of Shakespeare.(1)

However, most of this research does not deal with the specific analysis of the reception of individual plays. Research specifically focused upon individual plays is nevertheless necessary, as all of Shakespeare's plays were not equally popular among the children at that time. The popularity of *The Merchant of Venice* for children, therefore, should be analysed in order to establish its significance in the reception history of the play.

Prose story versions of *The Merchant of Venice* have attracted the attentions of fewer scholars so

far. Among the few scholars who discuss this topic, Linda Rozmovits, in *Shakespeare and the Politics of Culture in Late Victorian England*, argues that the prose stories of *The Merchant of Venice* published in this period showed contrasting attitudes toward Jewish people: some simply connecting Jews to evil, others being aware of their oppression and inequitable condition.(2) Janet Bottoms points out, though briefly, that the authors of prose versions of *The Merchant of Venice* were gradually becoming aware of the unjust situation of Shylock and of Jewish people.(3)

Bottoms and Rosmovits generalize the contrasting attitudes in stories by referring directly to several stories that were published in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. But Rosmovits analyzes only two stories, discussing only their beginnings, the part of the story which explains the relationship between Shylock and Antonio. Bottoms's analysis is even briefer: she refers to the beginning of Thomas Carter's version and his reincorporation of Shylock's "Hath not a Jew eyes" speech. The three stories out of numerous versions which these critics have considered are perhaps insufficient to consider this area in depth. Therefore, an analysis of more stories and scenes is required to develop such criticism more fully.

Through such an analysis, after establishing the importance of prose narrative versions of *The Merchant of Venice*, clearly, at first, I would like to support Rozmovits's and Bottoms's argument that the situation of Jewish people was represented in contrasting ways, with further evidence from stories and scenes. Subsequently, I would like to consider how such social attitudes are involved in the representation of Shylock.

## II

A gradual increase in emphasis on Shakespeare in schools can be easily traced by observing the spread of the subject of English, including English literature in the school curriculum in the 19th century. The paper known as the Newbolt report, which surveyed the circumstances surrounding education in English, reported that "[s]ince the last few decades of the Nineteenth century, the condition surrounding English literature has continually improved in most secondary schools."(4) The report observed in the chapter on drama that "Shakespeare is an inevitable and necessary part of school".(5)

The Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations also contributed significantly to popularizing Shakespeare's plays among children. In these local examinations, begun in 1857 by Oxford and in 1858 by Cambridge, the subject "English Language and Literature" was included from the first. Achieving good scores in the examinations was very important to students, as those successful could be excused from some university entrance examinations and from qualifying examinations for jobs.(6) The Oxford

local examinations and the Cambridge Senior (under eighteen examination) included Shakespeare as a part of "English" from 1858, as did the Cambridge Higher Local (over seventeen) from 1872 and the Cambridge Junior (under sixteen) from 1873. According to John D. Jones, though Shakespeare's plays were optional subjects in examinations, they were usually selected by pupils and functioned as a kind of a compulsory subject.(7) Thus Shakespeare's plays played more and more important roles in examinations and hence in education of children.

The inclusion of Shakespeare into the school curriculum and as an examination subject required the publication of Shakespeare's works especially prepared for children. Shakespeare's texts such as the Globe Edition (1864) were inadequate because of the difficulty of the plays and expressions inappropriate for children. The difficulty of Shakespeare's plays was widely acknowledged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. For example, *The Teaching of English in England* admits the difficulty of Shakespeare: "We have to accept as inevitable the fact that many passages of Shakespeare cannot be understood by children."(8) Therefore, it suggests that the teacher should prepare vocabulary in advance, before reading the play in classroom.(9)

Moreover, reading Shakespeare's plays means children could be exposed to inappropriate expressions. Some passages in Shakespeare's plays contain words or phrases having sexual implications, as Thomas and Henrietta Bowdler, the editors of *The Family Shakespeare*, and other authors of retold prose stories recognize. The Bowdlers, in the preface to *The Family Shakespeare*, say "[m]any words and expressions occur which are of so indecent a nature as to render it highly desirable that they should be erased." Authors of retold stories such as Mary Seamer and Samuel Brandram declare that, in constructing the narrative, they have taken "great care" not to include "objectionable expressions."(10) Inappropriate expressions, especially sexual, must be kept away from children in the highly morally restricted Victorian society.(11) Such expressions, therefore, had to be omitted or altered in order to protect children's morality as the Bowdlers did in *The Family Shakespeare*.

The moral context made it necessary to produce textbooks especially for children to read and study Shakespeare's plays, and led to important publishing activities in the area of children's reception of Shakespeare's works: the publication of school editions and of collections of retold stories. Evidently, these versions had great significance in children's primal understandings of Shakespeare's plays.

The school editions were prepared in order to avoid the problems of difficulty and inappropriateness in Shakespeare's plays. They consist mainly of three sections (introduction, text, and textual notes), with, in some cases, appendices.(12) The introduction, textual notes, and appendix are intended as aids for the reader's better understanding of the play, providing basic information about Shakespeare and

his play in the introduction, and explanations of the meanings of difficult words and phrases in the textual notes. Texts of the school editions were expurgated in the same way as *The Family Shakespeare* so that the problem of inappropriateness could be avoided.

Though these school editions were very helpful to children, Shakespeare's plays were still difficult for many of them. As Lois Grosvenor Hufford states in her preface to *Shakespeare in Tale and Verse*, "the author's purpose is to introduce Shakespeare to the young, and to such of their elders as find the intricacies of the plots of the dramas somewhat difficult to untangle."[13] Such retold prose narrative versions of Shakespeare's plays were thus published as an easier introduction to his plays, and these stories became extremely popular in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Many authors rewrote Shakespeare into prose, and *The Teaching of English in England* listed these as the most popular books read by elementary school children.[14]

These narrative versions were clearly intended as children's first experience of Shakespeare, as the prefaces or introductions to them indicated clearly. Alfred Ainger, the editor of *Tales from Shakespeare*, declares in his introduction that

> [m]ore and more is a knowledge of Shakespeare coming to be regarded as a necessary part of an English man's education; and the Editor knows of no first introduction to that study at once so winning and so helpful as that supplied by these narrative versions.[15]

This quotation shows Ainger thought the best way of learning Shakespeare was to start with retold stories. Referring to "young readers, who approach Shakespeare's work for the first time through the present narration of the stories of his plays" in his introduction to Mary Macleod's prose stories *The Shakespeare Story-Book*, Sidney Lee, a prominent Shakespearean scholar of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, also reveals that the book was planned to be read as the first contact with Shakespeare.[16] It seems, therefore, that children often first experienced Shakespeare through retold stories, and then read school editions as the next step.

The importance of Shakespeare for children can be established not only by its popularity and the fact that it functioned as the primary contact between Shakespeare and children, but also by the possibility that for many people, it was the only experience of Shakespeare at that time, as shown in Hufford's mention of the comparative unpopularity of Shakespeare:

> although in naming the best books of the world, Shakespeare is usually mentioned after the Bible, comparatively few of the great reading public are familiarly acquainted with Shakespeare's plays.[17]

In spite of Shakespeare's fame among "the great reading public," few seem to have read Shakespeare's plays at that time. Consequently, as Janet Bottoms argues, familiarity with Shakespeare was

**Table: Contents of retold stories published and reprinted between 1870 and 1920.**

| | AW | AC | AYL | CE | Cor | Cym | E3 | Ham | H1 | H4 | 2H4 | H5 | 1H6 | 2H6 | 3H6 | H8 | JC | KJ | KL | LLL | MA | Mac | MM | MN | MV | MW | Oth | Per | R2 | R3 | RJ | TC | Tem | TGV | Tim | Tit | TN | TNK | TS | WT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Lambs (1807) | O | × | O | O | × | O | × | O | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | O | O | O | O | × | O | O | O | × | × | O | × | O | O | × | O | O | × | O | O |
| Seamer (1880) | × | × | O | O | O | O | × | O | O | O | O | O | O | O | O | × | O | O | O | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | O | O | × | × | × | × | O | × | O | × | × | × | × | × |
| Brandram (1881) | × | × | O | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | O | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Valentine (1881) | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Barr (1882) | × | × | × | × | O | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | O | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Macfarland (1882) | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Morris (1892) | × | O | × | × | O | × | × | O | × | O | O | O | O | O | O | O | O | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Sim (1894) | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Nesbit (1897) | × | × | O | × | × | O | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Townesend(1899) | × | × | O | × | × | O | × | O | O | O | O | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Hufford (1902) | × | × | O | O | × | O | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Macleod (1902) | × | × | O | O | × | O | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Stidolph (1902) | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Lang [1] (1905) | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Lang [2] (n.d.) | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Hudson (1907) | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | O | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Carter (1910) | × | × | O | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |
| Hoffman (1911) | × | × | O | × | O | O | O | O | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | O | × | O | × | O | O | O | O | × | O | O | O | × | × | O | × | O | O | × | O | O | × | O | O |
| Maud (1913) | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | O | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × | × |

constructed not through the authentic text of Shakespeare, but through such texts, especially those prepared for young readers.[18]

In this context, *The Merchant of Venice* was one of the plays most frequently included in collections of Shakespeare for children. Jones lists it as one of "the plays, most commonly read in schools," and Kiddle and Schem in *The Cyclopœdia of Education* recommended reading "one or two plays, such as the *Merchant of Venice* or *King Lear*" in classroom.[19] In addition to this popularity, many school editions series, such as Clarendon Press Series, The Pitt Press Shakespeare and The "Swan" Shakespeare, published *The Merchant of Venice* in this period.

Numerous prose versions of *The Merchant of Venice* were also published in this period. As table 1. shows, almost all collections of the retold stories contain the play (MV), while plays whose themes were thought to be inappropriate for children, such as *Othello* (Oth), *All's Well That Ends Well* (AW), and *Measure for Measure* (MM) were rewritten in far fewer volumes than *The Merchant of Venice.*

Thus, *The Merchant of Venice* was quite popular both in school editions and in retold stories. However, the fact that only a very limited number of Shakespeare's plays were read in classroom possibly prevented children from reading the "play" version of *The Merchant of Venice*. As mentioned above, only one or two plays of Shakespeare were recommended to be taught in schools. Though Kiddle and Schem suggested that *The Merchant of Venice* should be read in the classroom, the play was, presumably, not always read in schools. It is very likely that the play was frequently excluded from the plays to be read at the class, for the syllabus of a one year's examination set *Henry V*, *Macbeth*, *The Tempest*, and *Hamlet* for examination subjects.[20] The number of children who read a prose version was, therefore, much greater than those who read the play in a school edition. Accordingly, the significance of the prose versions of *The Merchant of Venice* in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century is clear and a consideration of these texts should help to reconstruct the public understanding of the play.

## III

In this section I analyse the representation of Shylock in prose stories retelling *The Merchant of Venice*. The texts dealt with here are Thomas Carter's *Stories from Shakespeare*, Charles and Mary Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare*, Mary Seamer's *Shakespeare's Stories Simply Told*, and Mary Macleod's *Shakespeare Story-Book*.[21] The purpose of this section is, first, to support and enhance Bottoms's and Rozmovits's analysis, and then to go further and discuss how the authors' awareness of the unjust situation of Jewish people in these stories relates to the representation of Shylock.

Of course, each of these stories has its own significance. Though the Lambs' *Tales from*

*Shakespeare* was first published in 1807, much earlier than the period I discuss here, the collection was very frequently republished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. William Jaggard's bibliography records 87 publications between 1870 and 1910, while Stanley Wells says there is evidence of 95 publications between 1879 and 1920.[22] Though fewer than the Lambs, Mary Seamer's and Thomas Carter's stories also had frequent republications in this period. This fact may at least indicate some popularity of these books: the first publication of Seamer's stories was in 1880, and it was reprinted three times by 1900, while Carter's was first published in 1910, and had been reprinted 11 times by 1920.[23] Mary Macleod's volume, published in 1902, has a clear intention to replace the Lambs' *Tales*. Sidney Lee asserts in his introduction to Macleod's *Story-Book* that

> Lamb's Tales offer them a very fragmentary knowledge of the scope of Shakespeare's plots. An endeavour to supply young readers with fuller and more accurate account of them is therefore justified, and this endeavour is made in the present volume.[24]

I want to analyse especially the representations of Shylock's hatred against Antonio, the representations of his reaction to Jessica's elopement, and the way he accepts Portia's judgement in the court, and I want to show how these scenes reveal the authors' awareness of the unjust situation of Shylock and Jewish people and affect the representation of Shylock.

The reasons Shylock hates Antonio vary in each of prose stories: the Lambs and Seamer ascribe Shylock's hatred to his avarice, while Macleod and Carter partly attribute it to the "unjust" situation of Jewish people. The Lambs describe Shylock's hate: "Shylock as much hated Antonio, because he used to lend money people in distress, and would never take any interest for the money he lent..."[25] Clearly, the Lambs' Shylock hates Antonio as Antonio is kind enough to help people suffering from Shylock's usury. Therefore, the Lambs' Shylock cannot be interpreted as a victim of oppression at all, but simply as an evil, "hard-hearted" enemy of Christians, as he prospers through the heavy interest he imposes upon good people.

On the other hand, Macleod's Shylock has another reason for his hatred deriving more from the general situation of the Jewish people at the time the story of *The Merchant of Venice* took place: that is, the discrimination against Jews. Macleod's narrator explains the antagonism between Shylock and Antonio in this way:

> Shylock hated all Christians, which was scarcely to be wondered at, considering the way in which he had been treated, but the special object of his aversion was a certain wealthy merchant named Antonio. Shylock hated Antonio partly because, whenever they happened to meet, the merchant treated him with contemptuous scorn, but chiefly because Antonio lent out money gratis, and so brought down the rate of usury in Venice. (105)

As in the Lambs' story discussed above, Macleod's Shylock hates Antonio mainly because of his generosity. And Shylock has to suffer Antonio's condemnation. Moreover, Macleod's narrator states that Shylock may well feel enmity towards Christians because of their attitudes, as described earlier in the story:

> S[hunned], hated, despised, insulted, the Jews in the Middle Ages led a cruel and embittered existence among their Christian brethren. But beaten down and oppressed as they were in most of the countries of Europe... (Macleod 104)

Thus, Macleod observes, the Jewish people have to suffer widespread oppression in the world of the story.

Carter is also quite aware of this unjust situation of Jewish people and of Shylock. He remarks, describing Shylock's race, that "[w]hole centuries of insult and wrong had been inflicted upon his ancient race" (4), and that this situation is the primary cause of Shylock's being cruel and hard in usury: "[o]ppression corroded his heart ... and it sharpened alike the knife of his cruelty and the rapier of his wit" (5).

In Macleod and Carter, Shylock's hatred derives also from the unfair position of the Jewish people in Venice. Hence, Macleod's and Carter's Shylock is depicted as a kind of victim while his evil-mindedness is also noted in his relations with Antonio.

Thus Shylock in the prose stories published in this period was represented in contrasting lights: some emphasize simply the vicious element of Shylock, and others acknowledge the unjust situation of the Jews in which Shylock was placed. However, analyzing only the beginning of the stories cannot reveal completely how these attitudes relate to the representation of Shylock. Of course, there are several significant differences among these four stories. Especially, differences in the representation of Shylock's reaction to Jessica's elopement indicate significantly different representations of his character in these stories.

In Shakespeare, the description of Jessica's elopement functions as one of the crucial events in explaining Shylock's motive to have his pound of Antonio's flesh. Firstly, it injures Shylock's feelings greatly and it may have the direct effect of inspiring Shylock to revenge, as implied in Solanio's speech. After talking about Shylock's reaction to Jessica's elopement, Solanio warns of the possibility of Shylock's revenge: "Let good Antonio look he keep his day, / Or he shall pay for this" (2.8.25-26).[26] Shylock's cry, "My daughter! O my ducats! ..." (2.8.15-22), is sufficient for Solanio to feel uneasy about Shylock's revenge on Antonio for the loss of his daughter and his money.

Another significant event following the elopement is Jessica's extravagance. It also functions as another reason for Shylock's revenge in Shakespeare's text. Tubal reports that Jessica "spent in

Genoa... one night four-score ducats" and that he was shown a ring that Jessica paid for a monkey (3.1.101-102; 111-112). This action of Jessica disturbs Shylock's mind so much that he soon claims "I will have the heart of him if he forfeit" (3.1.119-120). This direct response implies the strong function of Jessica's prodigality as the trigger for Shylock's declaration of revenge.

As discussed here, Shylock's resolution is made following these events. Therefore, it seems undeniable that they are important factors in making Shylock decide to take Antonio's flesh. Moreover, these events can be interpreted sympathetically in *The Merchant of Venice*.

The sequence of Jessica's elopement and Shylock's reactions are generally treated in two ways in prose stories, with the Lambs and Seamer grouped into one and Macleod into the other. The Lambs and Seamer don't give Jessica's elopement the kind of functions seen in Shakespeare, as they refer to the elopement for the first time in Antonio's response to Portia's judgement on Shylock's attempted murder of Antonio. Seamer's Antonio "declared that he did not desire to the Jew's property, if he would make it over his death to his own daughter, whom he had discarded for marrying a Christian" (31). The Lambs' Antonio also "said that he would give up his share of Shylock's wealth, if Shylock would sign a deed to make it over at his death to his daughter and her husband; for Antonio knew that the Jew had an only daughter who had lately married against his consent to a young Christian, named Lorenzo, a friend of Antonio's, which had so offended Shylock, that he had disinherited her" (110).

There is no reference to Jessica's elopement or to her prodigality prior to these lines in Seamer and the Lambs. By omitting events concerning Jessica from their original position in Shakespeare, Shylock in Seamer and the Lambs cannot have any such justification for revenge; what he has as a reason is only his hatred toward Antonio, the legitimacy of which has already been denied in these two stories as discussed above.

On the other hand, in Macleod's version of the story, Shylock's reactions to Jessica's elopement and prodigality are depicted in much more detail than in these two versions. When he found Jessica had already left his house, Macleod's Shylock "was almost out of his mind with rage and grief, and from his frenzied ravings it was difficult to say which loss he felt the most- that of his ducats or his daughter" (115). Macleod also retains Jessica's prodigality and Shylock's grief: "[the] news of his daughter's reckless prodigality cut Shylock to the heart" (116). Then, after listening to the news of Antonio's losses, Shylock states that he will take Antonio's flesh. What is notable here is Macleod's almost complete retention of "Hath not a Jew eyes?" speech, while this speech is omitted from the Lambs and Seamer altogether. Frequently regarded as the "plea for Jews",[27] this speech easily causes sympathy for Shylock in reader's and audience's mind. So Macleod's story, preserving the sequence of Shylock's reactions towards Jessica's activity, keeps the possibility of a sympathetic reading of Shylock.

Carter's Shylock also had the opportunity to express his fury about Jessica's elopement, though Jessica's prodigality is omitted from the story. "He tore his garments and cried: "My daughter! O my ducats! ..." after he found Jessica had gone, and he assumed that his daughter's elopement had been helped by Antonio, "his hate against the merchant intensified a thousandfold" (12). Thus his intention to revenge Antonio also has a direct cause to make him decide to cut Antonio's flesh.

Another example of the difference can be seen in the last part of the court scene. Lamb and Seamer give very brief narration of Shylock's agreement about the Duke's and Antonio's requirement, Seamer only narrating "Shylock agreed, and begged leave to go away, and the court was dismissed" (31).

On the other hand, Macleod's narration represents Shylock's situation and feelings in much more detail.

> And what was left for Shylock to answer? Baffled of his revenge, stripped of his wealth, forced to disown his faith, his very life forfeited –a hated, despised, miserable old man –he stood alone amidst the hostile throng. Not one face looked at him kindly, not one voice was raised in his behalf. Twice he strove to speak, and twice he failed. Then in a hoarse whisper through the parched lips, came the faltering words:
>
> "I –am –content." (128)

"[A] hated, despised, miserable old man" and Shylock's standing "alone amidst the hostile throng" amply describe his miserable situation. And his attempt and failure to speak show us his suffering very clearly. Considering other elements of Macleod's story, this Shylock has much of a tragic character, a figure requiring some sympathy.

Though there are no elaborated descriptions of Shylock's feeling in Carter, the narrator expresses more direct sympathy for Shylock than Macleod does, as he declares that "we feel a throb of pity for the poor old alien who, beggared and doubly outcast, stood overwhelmed before the angry, jeering faces of the court" (23). In addition, Carter goes much further than Macleod by ending the story with the description of Shylock's miserable situation, quoting "Hath not a Jew eyes" speech.

> Perfect joy reigned in the fair palace on the Adriatic, and no one thought of that dark house in the Jewish quarter of Venice where Shylock brooded in poverty and sorrow, a forsaken, desolate outcast. "Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapon, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? (26-27)

In Carter's context, this speech is no longer the justification of "bloody vengeance"[28] at all, and Shylock is given the complete possibility of being interpreted sympathetically.

## IV

In conclusion, there are two principal tendencies in the descriptions of Shylock in the prose stories published in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The first is seen in the versions produced by the Lambs and Seamer, which represent Shylock as a complete villain and show no possibilities to interpret him sympathetically, with no reference to the situation around Shylock and Jewish people. The other is, like Macleod and Carter, reminding readers of the unfair situations around Jewish people, to give Shylock opportunities to express his feeling more and keep the possibility for Shylock to be interpreted sympathetically.

Until the late nineteenth century, the Lambs' *Tales from Shakespeare* was the only collection of prose stories of Shakespeare. This meant that only one way of seeing Shylock had been introduced until then. Subsequently, gradually, more and more stories that represented Shylock rather sympathetically began to appear for the use of children. This appearance of tragic Shylock might derive from the gradually improved situation of Jewish people at that time. But what is important is the fact that the general attitude towards Jewish people was still ambivalent and various versions of Shakespeare's stories reflect this context clearly. The introduction of various Shylocks is the notable event in the reception history of *The Merchant of Venice* among children at that time. However, the Lambs' enormous popularity, the publication of 26 editions, more than twice as many as Carter's of publications, even in 1910-20, seems to have prevented various attitudes toward Shylock from permeating into the initial experience of children in this period. Though it may require analysis of more retold stories, it seems possible to claim that for the many children who first experienced Shakespeare through such retold stories, Shylock was still simply a cruel and inhuman character, though this single way of seeing Shylock was rather out of date in the context of other Shakespearean activities such as theatrical productions and criticism of the play.

### Notes

(1) Stanley Wells, "Tales from Shakespeare," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 73 (1988): 125-52; Noel Perrin, *Dr. Bowdler's Legacy: A History of Expurgated Books in England and America* (Boston: David R. Godine, 1992); Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (London: Hogarth Press, 1989) 205-210; Janet Bottoms, ""To Read Aright": Representations of Shakespeare for Children." *Children's Literature* 32 (2004): 1-14.

(2) See Linda Rozmovits, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Culture in Late Victorian England* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998) 97-107.

(3) Bottoms 10-11.

(4) *Teaching of English in England* (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1921) 102-3

(5) *Teaching of English in England* 312.

(6) George Mariz, "Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations," *Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Sally Mitchell (New York; London: Garland, 1988) 565-566.

(7) John D. Jones, "Shakespeare in English School," *Jarhbuch der Deutchen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* 42 (1906): 115.

(8) *Teaching of English in England* 314.

(9) *Teaching of English in England* 313.

(10) Thomas Bowdler, ed., *The Family Shakespeare* (London: Longman, 1847) vii; Mary Seamer, *Shakespeare's Stories Simply Told* (London; Edinburgh; New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, n.d) v; and Samuel Brandram, *Shakespeare: Certain Selected Plays Abridged for the Use of the Young* (London: Smith, Elder, 1892) ix.

(11) For Victorian morality and children's reading at that time, see my paper "Learning to Read Shakespeare: Bowdlerized School Editions of *The Tempest* in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century," *Eibungaku* 91 (2006): *16*.

(12) For example, A. W. Verity's The Pitt Press Shakespeare has a "Glossary," "Appendix," and "Hints on Shakespeare's English." A. W. Verity, *The Merchant of Venice*, The Pitt Press Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907).

(13) Lois Grosvenor Hufford, *Shakespeare in Tale and Verse* (New York; London: Macmillan, 1902) vii.

(14) *Teaching of English in England* 375.

(15) Alfred Ainger, "Introduction," *Tales from Shakespeare*, by Charles and Mary Lamb (London; New York: Macmillan, 1887) xiii.

(16) Sidney Lee, "Introduction," *The Shakespeare Story-Book*, by Mary Macleod (London: W. Gardner, Darton & Co., 1902) xii.

(17) Hufford vii.

(18) Janet Bottoms, " 'Familiar Shakespeare'," *Where Texts and Children Meet*, ed., Eve Bearne and Victor Watson (London and New York: Routledge, 2000) 11

(19) Jones 115; Henry Kiddle, and A. J. Schem, eds., *The Cyclopaedia of Education: A Dictionary of Information for the use of Teachers, School Officers, Parents, and Others* (New York; London: E. Steiger & co.; S. Low & co., 1883) 278.

(20) Jones 115-117.

(21) Thomas Carter, *Stories from Shakespeare* (London; Calcutta; Sidney: George G. Harrap, 1910); Charles and Mary Lamb, *Tales from Shakespeare* (London: Puffin Books, 1987); Mary Seamer, *Shakespeare's Stories Simply Told* (London; Edinburgh; New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, n.d); and Mary Macleod, *The Shakespeare Story-Book* (London: W. Gardner, Darton & Co., 1902).

(22) See William Jaggard, *Shakespeare Bibliography: A Dictionary of Every Known Issue of the Writings of our National Poet and of Recorded Opinion Thereon in the English Language* (1971; Folkstone; London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1911) 572-584; and Wells 131. .

(23) Carter's book was reprinted in 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913 (twice), 1914, 1915 (twice), 1917, and 1920 (twice).

(24) Lee x.

(25) Charles and Mary Lamb, *Tales from Shakespeare* (London: Puffin Books, 1987) 99. All the quotations from the Lambs are from this edition.

(26) The quotations from *The Merchant of Venice* are from William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, The Oxford Shakespeare, ed., Jay L. Halio (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

(27) See Halio 46.

(28) Halio 161n.